

6
09/339, 325



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/339, 325 06/23/99 SHOHAM

Y 003660 P001X

EXAMINER

TM02/1114

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90025

ART UNITING J PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 24-6-2

11/14/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/339,325	Applicant(s) Shoham et al.
	Examiner John L. Young	Group Art Unit 2162

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 23, 1999

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2162

DRAWING OBJECTIONS

1. This application has been filed with drawings that have been objected to by the PTO draftsperson (see FORM PTO 948); therefore, said drawings are considered informal and acceptable for examination purposes only. "The applicant is required to submit acceptable drawings within three months from the mailing of the 'Notice of Allowability.'" (See 37 CFR 1.85(c)).

CLAIM REJECTIONS — 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶2

2. Independent claim 15 and dependent claims 16-21 are rejected as indefinite pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶2 as reciting an improper Markush Group.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 15, lines 3-4 recites in part:

one function . . . selected from the group comprising of a bid verifier, an information manager, a clearer, and a registration manager. . . .

Art Unit: 2162

Claim 15 is in improper Markush form and therefore indefinite because the open-ended terminology “the group comprising of A, B, and C” is used in place of “the group consisting of A, B and C” or “the group is A, B or C.” (See MPEP 2173.05(h)).

Claims 16-21 are rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶2 for substantially the same reasons as claim 15.

CLAIM REJECTIONS — 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2162

3. Independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Franklin et al. 6,055,518 (04/25/2000) [f/d: 11/12/1996] (herein referred to as “Franklin”).

As per claim 1, Franklin (the ABSTRACT; FIG. 1; col. 2, ll. 21-36; col. 3, ll. 4-50; col. 4, ll. 18-28; col. 5, ll. 5-12; col. 5, ll. 32-36; col. 6, ll. 38-42; col. 9, ll. 22-52; and col. 11, ll. 25-34) shows elements that suggest a “universal auction system having a programmable auction server, the programmable auction server comprising: a plurality of auction modules wherein at least one auction module corresponds to at least one function of an auction selected from the group consisting of a bid verifier, an information manager, a clearer, a registration manager, and a proxy bidder.”

Franklin does not explicitly show “a proxy bidder. . .” even though Franklin (col. 4, ll. 11-15) suggests “a proxy bidder.”

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of on-line auctions that Franklin’s “*identity of a . . . bidder [is] not revealed. . .*” (See Franklin col. 4, ll. 11-15) would have been selected in accordance with “a proxy bidder. . .” because such security measures would have provided a means to optimize secrecy. (See Franklin col. 4, ll. 11-15).

Dependent claim 2 is rejected for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

Art Unit: 2162

As per dependent claim 3, Franklin shows the system of claim 1 (See the rejection of claim 1 supra).

Franklin (FIG. 1; FIG. 2; col. 2, ll. 60-67; col. 3, ll. 1-2; col. 3, ll. 4-50; col. 4, ll. 35-50; col. 5, ll. 5-12; and col. 6, ll. 38-42) shows elements that suggest “a set of trading primitives; a script interpreter for interpreting a temporal protocol script representing an auction specification, the script including references to at least a portion of the set of trading primitives; and means for switching an auction specification of one phase with an auction specification of another phase.”

Franklin does not explicitly show “means for switching an auction specification of one phase with an auction specification of another phase. . . .” even though Franklin (col. 3, ll. 4-50) suggests “means for switching an auction specification of one phase with an auction specification of another phase. . . .”

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of on-line auctions that Franklin's “*auction typically consists of two phases. . . . At some point the bidding period is closed, thus initiating the second phase. . . .*” (See Franklin col. 3, ll. 3-10) would have been selected in accordance with “means for switching an auction specification of one phase with an auction specification of another phase. . . .” because such switching measures would have “guaranteed that no bid is revealed prior to the close of the bidding period.” (See Franklin col. 2, ll. 1-2).

Art Unit: 2162

As per dependent claim 4, Franklin shows the system of claim 3 (See the rejection of claim 3 supra).

Franklin (FIG. 1; FIG. 2; col. 2, ll. 60-67; col. 3, ll. 1-2; col. 3, ll. 4-10) shows elements that suggest “at least one auction module of one phase is replaced with at least one auction module of another phase.”

Franklin does not explicitly show “at least one auction module of one phase is replaced with at least one auction module of another phase. . . .” even though Franklin (FIG. 1; FIG. 2; col. 2, ll. 60-67; col. 3, ll. 1-2; col. 3, ll. 4-10) suggests “at least one auction module of one phase is replaced with at least one auction module of another phase.”

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of on-line auctions that Franklin's “*communications links and switching processors. . . .*” would have been selected in accordance with “at least one auction module of one phase is replaced with at least one auction module of another phase. . . .” because such switching measures would have provided means for a secure on-line auction network. (See Franklin col. 2, ll. 1-3).

As per dependent claim 5, Franklin shows the system of claim 1 (See the rejection of claim 1 supra).

Franklin (col. 3, ll. 4-58) shows elements that suggest “at least one phase comprising an interval in which at least one transaction occurs, the transaction is selected

Art Unit: 2162

from the group comprising submitting a bid, admitting a bid, withdrawing a bid, and replacing a bid.”

Franklin does not explicitly show “replacing a bid. . . .” even though Franklin (col. 3, ll. 4-58) suggests “replacing a bid.”

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of on-line auctions that Franklin's “*insert a bid. . . .*” would have been selected in accordance with “replacing a bid. . . .” because such measures would have provided means for implementing an on-line auction network. (See Franklin col. 2, ll. 1-3; and col. 3, ll. 1-50).

As per dependent claim 6, Franklin shows the method of claim 5 (See the rejection of claim 5 supra).

Franklin (col. 4, ll. 1-6; and col. 3, ll. 4-14) shows elements that suggest “wherein the phase is terminated by a condition.”

Franklin does not explicitly show “wherein the phase is terminated by a condition. . . .” even though Franklin (col. 4, ll. 1-6; and col. 3, ll. 4-14) suggests “wherein the phase is terminated by a condition.”

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of on-line auctions that Franklin's (col. 4, ll. 1-6; and col. 3, ll. 4-14) “*Validity. . . conditions. . . .*” and “*two phases. . . .*” would have been selected in accordance with “wherein the phase

Art Unit: 2162

is terminated by a condition. . . ." because such conditions would have facilitated complex on-line financial transactions, such as sealed bid auctions. (See Franklin col. 1, ll. 16-56).

As per dependent claim 7, Franklin shows the method of claim 6 (See the rejection of claim 5 supra).

Franklin (col. 4, ll. 1-6; and col. 3, ll. 4-14) shows elements that suggest "wherein the condition is a time period."

Franklin does not explicitly show "wherein the condition is a time period. . . ." even though Franklin (col. 4, ll. 1-6; and col. 3, ll. 4-14) suggests same.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of on-line auctions that Franklin (col. 4, ll. 1-6; and col. 3, ll. 4-14) "*Validity . . . conditions. . . .*"; "*two phases. . . .*"; and "*the end of the bidding period. . . .*" would have been selected in accordance with "wherein the condition is a time period. . . ." because such conditions would have facilitated complex on-line financial transactions, such as sealed bid auctions. (See Franklin col. 1, ll. 16-56).

4. Independent claims 8, 14 & 15 and dependent claims 9-13 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Franklin in view of Minton 6,014,643 (01/11/2000) [f/d: 08/26/1996] (herein referred to as "Minton").

As per claim 8, Franklin (the ABSTRACT; FIG. 1; col. 2, ll. 21-36; col. 3, ll. 4-50; col. 4, ll. 18-28; col. 5, ll. 5-12; col. 5, ll. 32-36; col. 6, ll. 38-42; col. 9, ll. 22-52; and col.

Art Unit: 2162

11, ll. 25-34) shows elements that suggest a “universal auction system comprising: a trading primitive; a script generator for translating trading primitives to temporal protocol script; a script interpreter for interpreting script protocol. . . .”

Franklin does not explicitly show “a market specification console adapted to support a plurality of market protocols.”

Minton (FIG. 1; FIG. 2; FIG. 4; FIG. 5; FIG. 6; FIG. 7; FIG. 10; FIG. 11; and FIG. 12) shows elements that suggest “a market specification console adapted to support a plurality of market protocols.”

Minton proposes “console” modifications that would have applied to the on-line auction system of Franklin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the “console” modifications to Franklin, because addition of such modifications would have provided a means “*whereby individuals can buy and sell directly from each other. . . .*” (See Minton col. 2, ll. 46-57).

As per claim 9, Franklin in view of Minton shows the system of claim 8 (See the rejection of claim 8 supra).

Franklin (col. 3, line 12) shows a “*deterministic rule. . . .*”

Franklin does not explicitly show “the market specification console further comprising a plurality of rules wherein at least one rule is user-modifiable.”

Art Unit: 2162

Minton (FIG. 5, el. 516; FIG. 6, el. 628, and el. 610; FIG. 7; FIG. 10; and FIG. 11) shows elements that suggest “the market specification console further comprising a plurality of rules wherein at least one rule is user-modifiable.”

Minton proposes “user-modifiable” rule modifications that would have applied to the on-line auction system of Franklin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the “user-modifiable” rule modifications to Franklin, because addition of such modifications would have provided a means “*whereby individuals can buy and sell directly from each other.* . . . ” (See Minton col. 2, ll. 46-57).

As per claim 10, Franklin in view of Minton shows the system of claim 9 (See the rejection of claim 9 supra).

Franklin does not explicitly show “wherein rules comprise market protocols.” Minton (FIG. 5; FIG. 6; FIG. 7; FIG. 10; and FIG. 11) shows elements that suggest “wherein rules comprise market protocols.”

Minton proposes market protocol modifications that would have applied to the on-line auction system of Franklin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the market protocol modifications to Franklin, because addition of such modifications would have provided a means “*whereby individuals can buy and sell directly from each other.* . . . ” (See Minton col. 2, ll. 46-57).

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 11, Franklin in view of Minton shows the system of claim 8 (See the rejection of claim 8 supra).

Franklin (FIG. 1; and col. 2, ll. 60-67) shows elements that suggest “a programmable auction server.”

Franklin does not explicitly show “wherein the market specification console is coupled to a programmable auction server wherein said programmable auction server is adapted to receive market protocols from said market specification console, the market specification console having a graphic user interface (GUI).”

Minton (FIG. 1; FIG. 2; FIG. 3; FIG. 4; FIG. 5; FIG. 6; FIG. 7; FIG. 10; and FIG. 11) shows elements that suggest “wherein the market specification console is coupled to a programmable auction server wherein said programmable auction server is adapted to receive market protocols from said market specification console, the market specification console having a graphic user interface (GUI).”

Minton proposes market specification console modifications that would have applied to the on-line auction system of Franklin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the market specification console modifications to Franklin, because addition of such modifications would have provided a means “*whereby individuals can buy and sell directly from each other. . .*” (See Minton col. 2, ll. 46-57).

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 12, Franklin in view of Minton shows the system of claim 11 (See the rejection of claim 11 supra).

Franklin (FIG. 1; col. 2, ll. 60-67; and col. 3, ll. 1-3) shows elements that suggest “wherein a trader interface is coupled to a network.”

Franklin does not explicitly show “wherein a trader interface is coupled to a network. . . .” even though Franklin (FIG. 1; col. 2, ll. 60-67; and col. 3, ll. 1-3) suggests “wherein a trader interface is coupled to a network.”

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of on-line auctions that Franklin's (FIG. 1; col. 2, ll. 60-67; and col. 3, ll. 1-3) “*auction system 100 . . . can be a network. . . .*” would have been selected in accordance with “wherein a trader interface is coupled to a network. . . .” because such a network would have facilitated complex on-line financial transactions, such as sealed bid auctions. (See Franklin col. 1, ll. 16-56).

As per claim 13, Franklin in view of Minton shows the system of claim 12 (See the rejection of claim 12 supra).

Franklin (col. 3, ll. 4-58) shows elements that suggest submitting a bid.

Franklin (FIG. 1; col. 2, ll. 60-67; and col. 3, ll. 1-3) shows elements that suggest “a trader interface is coupled to a network.”

Franklin does not explicitly show “a trader interface is coupled to a network. . . .” even though Franklin (FIG. 1; col. 2, ll. 60-67; and col. 3, ll. 1-3) suggests same.

Art Unit: 2162

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of on-line auctions that Franklin's (FIG. 1; col. 2, ll. 60-67; and col. 3, ll. 1-3) "*auction system 100 . . . can be a network . . .*" would have been selected in accordance with "a trader interface is coupled to a network . . ." because such a network would have facilitated complex on-line financial transactions, such as sealed bid auctions. (See Franklin col. 1, ll. 16-56).

As per claim 14, Franklin (the ABSTRACT; FIG. 1; col. 2, ll. 21-36; col. 3, ll. 4-50; col. 4, ll. 18-28; col. 5, ll. 5-12; col. 5, ll. 32-36; col. 6, ll. 38-42; col. 9, ll. 22-52; and col. 11, ll. 25-34) shows elements that suggest "means for transmitting at least one market protocol to a programmable auction server."

Franklin does not explicitly show "[a] market specification console comprising: means for specifying a plurality of market protocols; [and] means for displaying at least one market protocol. . . ."

Minton (FIG. 1; FIG. 2; FIG. 4; FIG. 5; FIG. 6; FIG. 7; FIG. 10; FIG. 11; and FIG. 12) shows elements that suggest "[a] market specification console comprising: means for specifying a plurality of market protocols; [and] means for displaying at least one market protocol. . . ."

Minton proposes "console" modifications that would have applied to the on-line auction system of Franklin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the "console" modifications to

Art Unit: 2162

Franklin, because addition of such modifications would have provided a means “*whereby individuals can buy and sell directly from each other. . . .*” (See Minton col. 2, ll. 46-57).

As per claim 15, Franklin (the ABSTRACT; FIG. 1; col. 2, ll. 21-36; col. 3, ll. 4-50; col. 4, ll. 18-28; col. 5, ll. 5-12; col. 5, ll. 32-36; col. 6, ll. 38-42; col. 9, ll. 22-52; and col. 11, ll. 25-34) shows elements that suggest a “method of designing a universal auction system comprising: generating a plurality of auction modules wherein at least one auction module corresponds to at least one function of an auction selected from the group comprising of a bid verifier, an information manager, a clearer, and a registration manager . . . and . . . implementing at least one transaction comprising a bid verification, information dissemination, clearing, and registration of information.”

Franklin (col. 3, line 12) shows a “*deterministic rule. . . .*”

Franklin does not explicitly show “specifying a plurality of rules wherein a transaction comprises at least one rule. . . .” even though Franklin (col. 3, line 12) suggests “specifying a plurality of rules wherein a transaction comprises at least one rule.”

Minton (FIG. 5, el. 516; FIG. 6, el. 628, and el. 610; FIG. 7; FIG. 10; and FIG. 11) shows elements that suggest “specifying a plurality of rules wherein a transaction comprises at least one rule.”

Minton proposes rule specifying modifications that would have applied to the on-line auction system of Franklin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the rule specifying modifications to

Art Unit: 2162

Franklin, because addition of such modifications would have provided a means “*whereby individuals can buy and sell directly from each other. . .*” (See Minton col. 2, ll. 46-57).

As per claim 16, Franklin in view of Minton shows the system of claim 15 (See the rejection of claim 15 supra).

Franklin (col. 3, line 12) shows a “*deterministic rule. . .*”

Franklin does not explicitly show “displaying a rule to a market designer.”

Minton (FIG. 5, el. 516; FIG. 6, el. 628, and el. 610; FIG. 7; FIG. 10; and FIG. 11) shows elements that suggest “displaying a rule to a market designer.”

Minton proposes rule display modifications that would have applied to the on-line auction system of Franklin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the rule display modifications to Franklin, because addition of such modifications would have provided a means “*whereby individuals can buy and sell directly from each other. . .*” (See Minton col. 2, ll. 46-57).

As per claim 17, Franklin in view of Minton shows the system of claim 15 (See the rejection of claim 15 supra).

Franklin (col. 3, line 12) shows a “*deterministic rule. . .*”

Franklin does not explicitly show “modifying at least one rule.”

Minton (FIG. 5, el. 516; FIG. 6, el. 628, and el. 610; FIG. 7; FIG. 10; and FIG. 11) shows elements that suggest “modifying at least one rule.”

Art Unit: 2162

Minton proposes rule modifications that would have applied to the on-line auction system of Franklin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the rule modifications to Franklin, because addition of such modifications would have provided a means “*whereby individuals can buy and sell directly from each other. . .*” (See Minton col. 2, ll. 46-57).

As per claim 18, Franklin in view of Minton shows the system of claim 15 (See the rejection of claim 15 supra).

Franklin (col. 3, line 12) shows a “*deterministic rule. . .*”

Franklin does not explicitly show “interpreting a scripted rule.”

Minton (FIG. 5, el. 516; FIG. 6, el. 628, and el. 610; FIG. 7; FIG. 10; and FIG. 11) shows elements that suggest “interpreting a scripted rule.”

Minton proposes rule modifications that would have applied to the on-line auction system of Franklin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the rule modifications to Franklin, because addition of such modifications would have provided a means “*whereby individuals can buy and sell directly from each other. . .*” (See Minton col. 2, ll. 46-57).

As per claim 19, Franklin in view of Minton shows the system of claim 15 (See the rejection of claim 15 supra).

Franklin (col. 3, line 12) shows a “*deterministic rule. . .*”

Art Unit: 2162

Franklin does not explicitly show “generating a scripted rule.”

Minton (FIG. 5, el. 516; FIG. 6, el. 628, and el. 610; FIG. 7; FIG. 10; and FIG. 11) shows elements that suggest “generating a scripted rule.”

Minton proposes rule modifications that would have applied to the on-line auction system of Franklin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the rule modifications to Franklin, because addition of such modifications would have provided a means “*whereby individuals can buy and sell directly from each other. . .*” (See Minton col. 2, ll. 46-57).

As per claim 20, Franklin in view of Minton shows the system of claim 15 (See the rejection of claim 15 supra).

Franklin (FIG. 1; col. 2, ll. 60-67; and col. 3, ll. 1-3) shows elements that suggest “a programmable auction server.”

Franklin (col. 3, line 12) shows a “*deterministic rule. . .*”

Franklin does not explicitly show “transmitting a rule to a programmable auction server.”

Minton (FIG. 1; FIG. 2; FIG. 4; FIG. 5; FIG. 6; FIG. 7; FIG. 10; FIG. 11; and FIG. 12) shows elements that suggest “transmitting a rule to a programmable auction server.”

Minton proposes rule modifications that would have applied to the on-line auction system of Franklin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

Art Unit: 2162

person having ordinary skill in the art to add the rule modifications to Franklin, because addition of such modifications would have provided a means "*whereby individuals can buy and sell directly from each other. . .*" (See Minton col. 2, ll. 46-57).

As per claim 21, Franklin in view of Minton shows the system of claim 15 (See the rejection of claim 15 supra).

Franklin (col. 3, ll. 4-58) shows elements that suggest submitting a bid.

Franklin does not explicitly show "maintaining the status of bids."

Minton (FIG. 1; FIG. 2; FIG. 4; FIG. 5; FIG. 6; FIG. 7; FIG. 10; FIG. 11; and FIG. 12) shows elements that suggest "maintaining the status of bids."

Minton proposes bid status modifications that would have applied to the on-line auction system of Franklin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the bid status modifications to Franklin, because addition of such modifications would have provided a means "*whereby individuals can buy and sell directly from each other. . .*" (See Minton col. 2, ll. 46-57).

RELEVANT PRIOR ART

5. The prior art references made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Art Unit: 2162

5,812,668, U.S. Pat. [Sep. 22, 1998]

Weber,

705/79

“SYSTEM, METHOD AND ARTICLE OF MANUFACTURE FOR
VERIFYING THE OPERATION OF A REMOTE TRANSACTION
CLEARANCE SYSTEM UTILIZING A MULTICHANNEL, EXTENSIBLE,
FLEXIBLE ARCHITECTURE.” This reference discusses remote transactions
over a network. (See the ABSTRACT) ref. claims 1-21.

CONCLUSION

6. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Any response to this action may be sent via facsimile to either:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications marked EXPEDITED

PROCEDURE), or

(703) 308-5397 (for informal communications marked PROPOSED or DRAFT).

Hand delivered responses may be brought to:

Sixth floor Receptionist
Crystal Park II
2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington, Virginia.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John L. Young who may be reached via telephone at (703) 305-3801. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M.

Art Unit: 2162

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, may be reached at (703) 305-9768.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

John L. Young



Patent Examiner

November 10, 2000



JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100